



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/874,012	06/06/2001	Shigehiro Kadota	35.C15407	7491

5514 7590 05/17/2006

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, JENNIFER T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2629

DATE MAILED: 05/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/874,012

Applicant(s)

KADOTA ET AL.

Examiner

Jennifer T. Nguyen

Art Unit

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,6-9 and 11-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,6-9 and 11-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is responsive to amendment filed on 12/21/2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-4, 6-9, and 11-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aratani et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,538,675) in view of Kuzunuki et al. (Patent No. 5,917,475).

Regarding claims 1 and 6, referring to Figs. 1 and 4A-8B, Aratani teaches a display apparatus (31) displaying images from a plurality of information processing apparatuses (1-1 to 1-4), comprising:

image inputting means (2-1 to 2-4) for inputting respective image signals from the plurality of information processing apparatuses (1-1 to 1-4) (col. 4, lines 16-24);

display controlling means (6) for constructing on a display screen display regions (13) in which respective images corresponding to the image signals from the plurality of information processing apparatuses (1-1 to 1-4) are displayed (col. 4, lines 56-65);

inputting means (21) for inputting a signal containing coordinate information corresponding to a position on the display screen;

determining means (14) for determining an information processing apparatus (1-1 to 1-4) to which converted information is sent, based on the input signal inputted by the inputting means (21); and

means (i.e., USB) for sending the converted information (i.e., converted X and Y information) to the information processing apparatus (i.e., the image source 1-1) determined by determining means (14), wherein the converted information is converted from the coordinate information such that the information processing apparatus determined by said determined means can use the converted information as coordinate information (col. 7, line 49 to col. 8, line 12) without using information indicating where the display region in which the image signal outputted by the information processing apparatus determined by determining means is positioned on the display screen.

Aratani differs from claims 1 and 6 in that he does not specifically teach the inputting means is positioned over a display surface of the display screen.

Kusunuki teaches a inputting means (fig. 1, i.e., touch pad 1 and stylus 2) is positioned over a display surface (LCD 3) of a display screen (col. 3, line 61 to col. 4, line 7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the inputting means as taught by Kusunuki in the system of Aratani in order to allow indicating coordinate information on a screen quickly and efficiently.

Regarding claims 2 and 7, Aratani further teaches the determining means (14) determines an information processing apparatus (1-1 to 1-4) to which the input signal is sent, based on the coordinate on the display screen (13) indicated by said input signal (from col. 9, line 39 to col. 10, line 47).

Regarding claims 3 and 8, Aratani further teaches the display controlling means (6) displays on a first display region (1-1) (Fig. 2) an image signal from a first information processing apparatus (1-1), and displays on a second display region (1-2) (Fig. 2) at least one

Art Unit: 2629

image signal from a second information processing apparatus (1-2) in the first display region (from col. 4, line 8 to col. 5, line 65).

Regarding claims 4 and 9, Aratani further teaches the display controlling means (6) divides said display screen into screens (A, B, C, and D) (Fig. 4A), the number of which is equal to the number of said plurality of information processing apparatuses (1-1 to 1-4), to construct display regions in which respective image signals from the plurality of information processing apparatuses are displayed (from col. 11, line 27 to col. 12, line 15).

Regarding claim 11, Aratani teaches all the subject matter claimed except for the use of the computer circuitry instead of program code. However, those skilled in the computer art it is obvious that such implementation can be expressed in terms of either computer program or a computer circuitry implementation, the two being functional equivalent of one another. See In re Ruff, 256 F. 2d 590, 118 USPQ 340, 343 (CCPA 1958).

Regarding claim 12, referring to Figs. 1 and 4A-8B, Aratani teaches a display apparatus (31) performing display based on a first image signal, which is an image signal from a first information processing apparatus (1-1) that performs a predetermined information processing based on a coordinate signal representing a predetermined position on the screen displayed on the basis of a signal outputted by the first information processing apparatus , and a second image signal, which is an image signal from a second information processing apparatus (1-2) that performs a predetermined information processing based on a coordinate signal representing a predetermined position on the screen (13) displayed on the basis of a signal outputted by the second information processing apparatus (col. 9, line 55 to col. 10, line 9), the display device comprising:

Art Unit: 2629

a receiving circuit (20) receiving said first image signal and said second image signal;
a coordinate information receiving circuit (19) receiving signals from a coordinate input device (21) that transforms into a signal an indicated position on a display surface on which a screen based on said first image signal and a screen based on said second image signal are displayed;

a circuit (18) for converting the signal inputted from the coordinate input device into the converted coordinate information; and

and a communication circuit (i.e. USB) sending the converted information processing apparatus, wherein the converter information sent to the first information processing apparatus (1-1) has coordinate information which can be used in said first information processing apparatus without using information indicating where the screen based on said first image signal is positioned on the display surface, and the converted information sent to the second information processing apparatus (1-2) has coordinate information which can be used in said second information processing apparatus without using information indicating where the screen based on said second image signal is positioned on the display surface (col. 7, line 49 to col. 8, line 12).

Regarding claim 13, Aratani further teaches that the apparatus further comprising said coordinate input device (21) (Fig. 1).

Regarding claim 14, Aratani further teaches the coordinate input device (21) is provided in such a manner that the coordinate device is placed over said display surface (13) (from col. 7, line 45 to col. 8, line 31).

Art Unit: 2629

Regarding claims 15 and 16, Aratani further teaches coordinate input device (21) electrically reads the indicated position on said display surface (13) (from col. 9, line 39 to col. 10, line 47).

Regarding claims 17-21, Aratani further teaches the determination circuit (14) determines an information processing apparatus (1-1 to 1-4) to which said input signal is sent, according to information that is given externally (from col. 9, line 39 to col. 10, line 47).

Regarding claims 22-31, Aratani further teaches the determination circuit (14) determines an information processing apparatus (1-1 to 1-4) to which said input signal is sent, based on said input signal (from col. 9, line 39 to col. 10, line 47).

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 6-9, and 11-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer T. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-7696. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri: 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe can be reached on 571-272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jennifer Nguyen
5/12/06



RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600